

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT KNOXVILLE

MICHAEL B. REED, et al., )  
)  
Plaintiffs, )  
)  
v. ) No. 3:18–CV–201  
)  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
)  
Defendant. )  

---

BRITTANY N. HYRE ANCULLE, et al., )  
)  
Plaintiffs, )  
)  
v. ) No. 3:18–CV–308  
)  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
)  
Defendant. )  

---

BRITTANY ADKINS, et al., )  
)  
Plaintiffs, )  
)  
v. ) No. 3:18–CV–310  
)  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
)  
Defendant. )  

---

JAMES CARL VANCE, et al., )  
)  
Plaintiffs, )  
)  
v. ) No. 3:19–CV–283  
)  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
)  
Defendant. )

---

JACKIE SUE BARNES, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Defendant.

---

No. 3:19-CV-296

AMERICAN RELIABLE INSURANCE  
COMPANY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Defendant.

---

No. 3:19-CV-469

STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY  
COMPANY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Defendant.

---

No. 3:19-CV-470

UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE  
ASSOCIATION, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 3:19-CV-472

Defendant.	)	
_____	)	
ALLSTATE FIRE AND CASUALTY	)	
INSURANCE COMPANY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 3:19–CV–474
	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	
AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE	)	
COMPANY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 3:19–CV–478
	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	
PAUL W. ABBOTT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 3:20–CV–149
	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

### ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Parties’ Joint Motion for Amended Scheduling Order. [Doc. 150]. Two motions to dismiss filed by the United States are currently pending on the Court’s docket. [Docs. 109, 110]. The Court took them under advisement after hearing oral argument. Having considered the Parties’ Joint Motion for Amended Scheduling Order, the amended

scheduling order may still be unworkable while the motions to dismiss are outstanding. Therefore, the Parties' Joint Motion for Amended Scheduling Order, [Doc. 150], is DENIED.

Having acknowledged the need to resolve the pending motions to dismiss, the Court will use its broad discretion and authority over its docket to stay these proceedings and discovery. *Shelbyville Hosp. Corp. v. Mosley*, No. 4:13-CV-88, 2016 WL 11508264, at \*2 (E.D. Tenn. July 25, 2016) (quoting *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706-07 (1997)). Therefore, this consolidated action is STAYED until further order of the Court.

So ordered.

ENTER:

---

s/J. RONNIE GREER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE